

MR. K. GEORGE (*Financial Secretary to Government*): It is less than Rs. 2,500 a year—manufacture, supervision, cost of paper, all taken together amounting only to about Rs. 2,350.

MR. M. R. MADHAVA VARIAR (*Chengannur cum Pattanam-titta*): I beg to withdraw the motion.

The motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

PRESIDENT: I now put Demand V—Stamps for a grant of Rs. 71 lakh for the vote of the House.

The grant was made.

DEMAND VI—REGISTRATION.

MR. R. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*): Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 2.53 lakhs under Demand VI—Registration.

Motions 129 and 130.

The following motions were not moved :—

MR. M. R. MADHAVA VARIAR:

129. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 8,000 for binding charges by Rs. 100.

MR. T. M. CHIDAMBARATANU PILLAI:

130. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,700 for Direction by Rs. 100.

Motion 131.

MR. N. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI (*Vaikam cum Ettumanur*): I beg to move the following motion :—

131. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,12,300 for Sub-Registrars by Rs. 100.

I have sent up the motion to draw attention to Rule 58 of the Registration Rules and the Government Order dated the 19th May, 1924, adding a proviso to that rule. The interpretation of Rule 58 by the registration officers caused a great hardship and as a result of the representations in the Popular Assembly and interpellations in this House the new proviso was added to the Section. Rule 58 runs thus :—

"58 (1) When in the course of attendance at a private residence the registering officer is required to accept for registration or to record the admission in respect of several documents executed by one person or to record in respect of the same document or documents the admission also of other persons residing together and entitled to the concession, the request may be complied with without levy of additional attendance fee.

(2) Similarly, several powers of attorney executed by the same person or signatures to a joint power of attorney of several persons residing together and entitled to the concession may be attested by the registering officer in the course of attendance without levy of additional attendance fee."

I do not wish to enter into a discussion as to the correctness of the interpretation put upon the word "and entitled to the concession." The dispute has been set at rest by the proviso added to the Rule, viz.:—

"Provided that in the cases mentioned in sub-rules 1 and 2 the admission of executants not entitled to the concession may also be recorded or their execution of powers of attorney may also be attested on payment to the registering officer of Rs. 2 in respect of each such execution."

Vol. V. No. 7.

[Mr. R. Krishna Pillai.]

Though one hardship has been removed, a greater hardship has been imposed by the condition that a payment of Rs. 2 has to be made in the case of every executant. This means that, if there are several executants of a document, each of those who are not entitled to the concession has to pay a sum of Rs. 2 to get his admission recorded. On account of the prohibitory charge, the proviso is not likely to be of much value and will rarely be availed of by the people. Even from the standpoint of revenue, it is not good to fix a high rate like this. The main cause of complaint against the old rule was that it made it impossible for the registering officer to complete the execution of a document in one and the same place and in the presence of all the parties and that it consequently led to unnecessary trouble and dispute. The complaint was raised not because people found it merely convenient or comfortable to have the documents registered in their homes. The difficulty has not at all been removed by the proviso requiring payment of such heavy fees. It is not clear why Government should impose such a heavy charge for the execution of documents in these cases. The registering officer has in any case to go to the private residence of the parties concerned and much of public time is not lost by recording the admission of all the parties. The rule itself does not seem to have been deliberately enacted nor was there such a rule under the old Registration Regulation. Registration and stamp fees were greatly enhanced by the new Regulations and there is no justification for imposing an additional tax on the executants in such cases.

I wish also to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that very great hardship is felt by the people in this matter and there is sufficient justification for their complaints. Those who know the difficulties of executing documents requiring the consent of several persons can very well appreciate the necessity for further amendment of the rule. We are thankful for what the Government have done in enacting the enabling proviso, but a further amendment is absolutely necessary to make it really beneficial. I would therefore respectfully suggest that either the proviso and the words "and entitled to the concession" in Rule 58 be deleted or the fee fixed in the proviso be reduced.

MR. R. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*): Sir, this additional fee of Rs. 2 was imposed in view of the additional labour thrown on the registering officer. Formerly, they had to pay Rs. 10 in the case of those who were not entitled to the concession. Afterwards, it was fixed at Rs. 2. I do not think Rs. 2 can be considered very excessive. Nevertheless, Government have no objection to examine the question whether the fee could be reduced.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Nedumangad*): May I ask the Chief Secretary how many Sub-Registrars there are in the Neyyattinkara taluk?

MR. R. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*): There is a Sub-Registrar at Neyyattinkara. There is an additional

Sub-Registrar at Amaravila. I do not exactly remember the number of Sub-Registrars in the taluk.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Nedumangad*): May I know from Mr. Krishna Pillai how many Sub-Registrars there are in the Nedumangad taluk?

PRESIDENT: How does it arise out of this motion?

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Nedumangad*): I want to speak on this motion on the basis of the information.

PRESIDENT: He cannot reply to you off-hand. You may speak.

MR. R. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*): I cannot give an answer off-hand.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Nedumangad*): Any how the Chief Secretary has been pleased to give me some information. He admits that there are two Sub-Registrars and I can indent upon my personal experience and say that, in the very large taluk of Nedumangad, there are only two Sub-Registrars and both of them are at the taluk headquarters. There has been a demand from the people of Kattakadai and adjoining places—a demand for the establishment of a Sub-Registrar's Cutcherry in Kattakadai. Kattakadai is a growing mercantile centre. The Nedumangad taluk is an unfortunate taluk because in order to file a case in the Munsiff's Court one has to submit oneself to three jurisdictions *i. e.*, one to Chirayinkil, one to Trivandrum and another to Neyyattinkara. Now, consistently with the rule for the registration of documents, people from various *pakuthies* of Nedumangad are obliged to go to Maranallur which is in the Neyyattinkara taluk. Now the Sub-Registrars' Cutcherries are centres of civilization and every facility should be afforded to the people to get deeds registered according to their convenience; and if at the same time some *pakuthies* of the Nedumangad taluk could be separated and tacked on to the Sub-Registrar's jurisdiction in Maranallur, I do not see any reason why these *pakuthies* of the Nedumangad taluk should not be clubbed together and brought under the jurisdiction of a Sub-Registrar to be stationed at Kattakadai. If there is not enough work, some *pakuthies* from Neyyattinkara may be added. The people of Neyyattinkara cannot complain about it because hitherto they were in a position of advantage. The importance of Kattakadai does not require reiteration. I wish to point out this fact for the kind attention of Government so that a redistribution of *pakuthies* may take place and the demand made by the people of Nedumangad may be sympathetically considered.

MR. N. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI (*Vaikam cum Ettumanur*): Sir, I admit that the Government have conceded a good deal in enacting a proviso and we are thankful for the concession made by the Government. The complaint is that the fee charged is high, considering the general poverty of the people. In view of the fact that the Government are prepared to consider the matter further, I withdraw the motion.

The motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

[Mr. N. Kumaran.]

Motions 132 to 135.

The following motions were not moved:

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI :

132. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 2.53 lakhs under Demand VI by Rs. 100.

MR. M. R. MADHAVA VARIAR :

133. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 2.53 lakhs under Demand VI by Rs. 100.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN :

133. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 2.53 lakhs under Demand VI by Rs. 100.

PRESIDENT: I will now place Demand VI—Registration—for Rs. 2.53 lakhs for the vote of the House.

The grant was made.

DEMAND VII.—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION.

MR. R. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*): Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 1.92 lakhs under Demand VII—General Administration—Huzur Cutcherry, etc.

Motion 135.

MR. V. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): Sir, I beg to move the following motion:—

135. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,905 for short-hand reporters by Rs. 500.

My object in making this motion is to see whether there is any feasibility of making a cut under this allotment by eliminating one short-hand reporter at least. I think the officer in charge of this Demand will explain the situation by quoting the salary and the number of short-hand reporters in other places.

MR. R. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*): Sir, I can give the information in regard to Madras. There are twelve short-hand reporters drawing a salary ranging from Rs. 125 to Rs. 200. We have only half the number and I find that the quantity of work turned out here is almost identical with the quantity in other places.

MR. V. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): I withdraw the motion.

The motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

Motion 136.

MR. N. KUMARAN (*Nominated*): Sir, I beg to move the following motion:—

136. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 11,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 7,000.

I find that a sum of Rs. 11,000 is budgeted for travelling allowance to the Huzur Cutcherry, and about Rs. 8,000 and odd has been spent in 1098. I should like to know who the officers are in the Huzur Cutcherry